

REMARKS

Claims 16 through 24 are in the application. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 16, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Plantz et al., U.S. Patent 6,088,702 ("Plantz") and claims 18 and 20 are similarly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plantz.

Before discussing the claims and the reference (Plantz) in detail, applicants will first point out a basic problem with all of the rejections propounded by the Examiner. In brief, Plantz discusses assignments of editors to projects or portions of projects only briefly and in passing, and does not describe in any detail whatever how editors are assigned to projects. Thus the reference entirely fails to disclose in any way selecting a reviewer or editor based on a content type specific template or based on a tag applied to a draft document.

Claim 16

Claim 16 is directed to a "method" which includes "allowing a content creator to log into a system" and "providing a content type specific template to the content creator", where the content type specific template is "associated with a particular content type of a plurality of content types supported by the system". The claimed method further includes "allowing the content creator to create a draft by using the content type specific template" and "selecting at least one of a reviewer and an editor from among a plurality of reviewers and editors accessible via the system". The selecting of the at least one of a reviewer and an editor is "based at least in part on the content type specific template". Finally, claim 16 recites "transmitting the draft to the selected at least one of a reviewer and an editor".

As will be surmised from the introductory remarks made before, applicants strongly contest the Examiner's assertion that Plantz anticipates the claim step of selecting at least one of a reviewer and an editor "based at least in part on [a] content type specific template".

Applicants will first dispose of the assertion made by the Examiner at the next to last paragraph of page 3 of the present Office Action that this feature of claim 16 is disclosed at Col. 9, lines 50-65 of the reference:

- Lines 49-51 of column 9 relate to spell checking, not selection of an editor or reviewer;
- Lines 51-53 relate to allowing an author to enter personal information;
- Lines 53-55 relate to displaying the date and time when a document was last modified;
- Lines 55-56 relate to displaying the date on which the document was completed;
- Lines 56-63 relate to displaying completion dates of assigned aspects of editing tasks, which display may include editorial signoffs on the document; and
- Lines 63-66 relate to providing links to databases or search engines.

None of these portions of Col. 9, lines 50-65 even begins to support the asserted disclosure of assigning a reviewer or editor based at least in part on a content type specific template. Not one even mentions a “template” or any possible synonym therefor. The most nearly pertinent portion refers to “assigned aspects of editing tasks”, but this portion certainly does not teach or suggest how editors or tasks are assigned, nor does it in the slightest teach or suggest assigning editors based on content type specific templates. Applicants simply do not understand how or why the Examiner can cite Col. 9, lines 50-65 of the reference in support of an alleged disclosure of the claimed feature of selecting a reviewer or editor based at least in part on a content type specific template.

Applicants will next address the Examiner’s asserted “response to arguments” on this topic which appears in the first paragraph on page 2 of the present Office Action.

First the Examiner refers to the text “assigned aspects of the editing tasks” which appears at line 57 of column 9 of the reference. This passage was already discussed above, but to now go into more detail, applicants accept that in the document creation projects of Plantz, as in any other document creation projects, editing tasks may be assigned. But the key question is, in what manner are editing tasks assigned in Plantz? Neither this passage, nor any other portion the reference, provides any detail about how editing assignments are made. There is certainly no disclosure whatsoever of assigning an editor based on a document template.

Next the Examiner refers to the passage “facilitates editor assignment by invoking a display of all topics, as well as the names of all the editors assigned to that topic” which appears

at column 11, lines 37-39 of this reference. This passage also clearly fails to support the Examiner's contention that Plantz teaches selecting an editor or reviewer based at least in part on a template. Nothing whatsoever in the passage describes or discusses a template, let alone selecting an editor based on a template. Rather, the passage would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art that a number of topics are displayed to a user, who presumably makes the assignment of editors to topics. This is completely different from selecting a reviewer or editor based at least in part on a template.

The Examiner next states:

Plantz further discloses under the 110 Selected Project section of providing Examples of the format and editing links associated with the subject matter of the document. Thus, Plantz discloses two ways an editor may be assigned to a document. The first being a template and the second being by the GPS system administrator.

In regard to this passage of the Office Action, which the applicants respectfully must assert is full of errors, the display window 110 is clearly described as allowing a user to select a document topic to be viewed, and has nothing whatsoever to do with assignment of editors. Please refer to column 8, lines 40-51 of the reference, which clearly sets forth the function of the display window 110 as stated in the previous sentence of this Response.

Furthermore, the Examiner appears to have mistakenly concluded that the term "Document Format" indicated at 115 in Fig. 1 is a synonym for the claim term "template". Such is not the case. Instead, as set forth in the reference at column 8, lines 47-49, item 115 allows the user to select whether results of a topic search are to be retrieved as an entire document, as a complete file, or as an extract. That is, item 115 controls the format in which search results are displayed and cannot satisfy the "content type specific format" used for creating a draft, as recited in claim 16.

Applicants further respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion that the Selected Project window 110 provides an "example" of "editing links associated with the subject matter of the document". The window 110 provides facilities for searching by topic, by keyword or with other search algorithms, and has nothing to do with "editing". Nor is it apparent what the Examiner is referring to by "editing links". In any case, it is plain that this portion of the reference (Fig. 1,

item 110 and column 8, lines 40-51) does not in any way disclose assignment of an editor, much less assignment based on a template.

Thus applicants must also traverse the Examiner's statement that the reference discloses two ways an editor may be assigned to a document, one being by template and the other by the system administrator. While applicants agree that assignment of editors by a system administrator is suggested by the reference, applicants strongly disagree with the Examiner's contention that the reference in any way teaches or suggests that a "template" is used in any manner in the reference in connection with assignment of editors. There is simply no evidence whatsoever in the reference to support the Examiner's position on this point.

To summarize, Plantz does not suggest anything other than selection of authors or editors manually by a system administrator based on criteria which are not stated in the reference. The reference contains no disclosure concerning selecting an editor based on a template that was used to create the document to be edited.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the Plantz reference clearly fails to anticipate at least the feature of claim 16 that recites selecting at least one of a reviewer and an editor based at least in part on a content type specific template. It is therefore requested that the rejection of claim 16 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 17-20

Claims 17-20 are dependent on claim 16 and are submitted as patentable on the same basis as claim 16.

Moreover, claim 17 recites a further limitation which is believed to support patentability of claim 17 independent of claim 16. Specifically, claim 17 recites that the method thereof further comprises "allowing the content creator to select the content type specific template from among a plurality of content type specific templates supported by the system." It is respectfully submitted that no disclosure or suggestion of this limitation is present in the Plantz reference.

In discussing claim 17 the Examiner merely asserts that the limitation is disclosed in the reference and cites a passage at column 9, lines 1-15 of the reference. Once more applicants must respectfully point out that the Examiner has cited a portion of the reference that fails to support the Examiner's contention. The passage at column 9, lines 1-15 does not in any way

disclose a “plurality of content type specific templates” nor selecting one of the same. Rather, the passage (which actually begins at column 8, line 67) is concerned with display options provided by the Group Publishing System to display various types of information, such as topic name, e-mail links to assigned authors or editors, topics for which no author or editor has been assigned, or a sample format.

The applicants wish to underscore that these display options cannot satisfy the claimed “plurality of content type specific templates” since the selected template is specified in claim 16 as being used to create a draft. The passage at column 9, lines 1-15 does not disclose plural templates of which one may be selected to be used to create a draft.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 17 is patentable for the additional reasons stated above.

Claim 20 is also believed to be patentable on further grounds that are independent of the basis for patentability of claim 16.

Claim 20 recites the further limitations:

applying a tag to the draft;

wherein the selecting the at least one of a reviewer and an editor is based at least in part on the tag applied to the draft.

The Examiner discusses claim 20 at page 6 of the present Office Action. In an assertion that is traversed below the Examiner states that Plantz discloses two types of tags. But what is most significant about the Examiner’s discussion of claim 20 is what it fails to include: The Examiner completely fails to address the claim limitation that at least one of a reviewer and an editor is selected “based at least in part on the tag applied to the draft”. For this reason standing alone, the rejection of claim 20 is fatally flawed and should be withdrawn. Also, as will be appreciated from prior discussion, the reference does not in any way teach or suggest selection of a reviewer or editor based at least in part on a tag applied to a draft that is to be reviewed or edited.

Applicants also traverse the Examiner’s contention that the URL referred to in the reference and the so-called project numbers **102, 103, 104** constitute “tags”. First of all, the numbers **102, 103, 104** are in fact reference numerals used by the drafter of the Plantz patent to

refer to project entries included in window 101 shown in Fig. 1. These numerals have nothing whatsoever to do with tagging a document. Furthermore, a URL, as clearly stated in the reference at column 8, lines 1-3 and as is well known, is merely an address for a unique file or set of files hosted on a particular server. This is totally different from a tag appended to a document for indexing purposes. Typically a URL is not appended to a document that it represents the address of.

For these reasons, and particularly the Examiner's clear failure to address an important limitation of claim 20, it is respectfully submitted that patentability of claim 20 has been established independent of claim 16.

Claims 21-24

Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plantz et al.

Claim 21 is directed to a "method" which includes "allowing a content creator to log into a system", "allowing the content creator to create a draft in the system", "applying a tag to the draft" and "selecting at least one of a reviewer and an editor from among a plurality of reviewers and editors accessible via the system". The selecting of the at least one of a reviewer and an editor is "based at least in part on the tag applied to the draft". Finally, claim 21 recites "transmitting the draft to the selected at least one of a reviewer and an editor".

It is noted that claim 21 shares with claim 20 the limitations of "applying a tag to the draft" and selecting at least one of a reviewer and an editor for the draft "based at least in part on the tag applied to the draft". Further, the Examiner's discussion of claim 21, and the second paragraph of his "response to arguments", parallels his treatment of claim 20. Most notably, as in the case of claim 20, the Examiner completely fails to address the claim feature of selecting at least one of a reviewer and an editor "based at least in part on the tag applied to the draft". Moreover this feature is in no way disclosed or suggested by the reference, which in fact provides no teaching whatsoever as to a basis or bases for assigning editors. Thus claim 21 should be found allowable, since an important feature of the claim simply is not present in the Plantz reference.

Applicants also respectfully refer the Examiner to applicants' traversal stated above in connection with claim 20 in regard to the alleged disclosure of tagging in Plantz.

Claims 22-24 are dependent on claim 21 and are submitted as patentable on the same basis as claim 21.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-3460.

Respectfully submitted,



May 11, 2004
Date

Nathaniel Levin
Registration No. 34,860
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Five Elm Street
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-3460